



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

09/594,152 06/12/00 IMANAKA

R MAT-3720US1

┌

TM01/0605

└

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

RATNER & PRESTIA  
P O BOX 980  
VALLEY FORGE PA 19482

GRANT.C

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2611

DATE MAILED:

06/05/01

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

SV

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/594,152

Applicant(s)

IMANAKA

Examiner

Christopher Grant

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 21, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17, and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 17, and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 3
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2611

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Reissue Applications*

#### *Specification*

1. There are several re-issue applications for patent 5790172 (patented application 08/503604). The current re-issue application must be amended to include a cross reference to all the other related re-issue applications for the patent at line 1 of the first page of the specification.

#### *Double Patenting*

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 14, 17 and 18 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14 and 22 of co-pending Application No. 09/631,540. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are different definitions or descriptions of the same subject matter, varying in breadth. For example:

Art Unit: 2611

a) the claimed “*recording medium used for an information on demand system*” (lines 1-3) of current application claim 17 corresponds to “*an information receiver....on a recording medium*” (lines 1-4) of the ‘540 co-pending application claim 14;

b) the claimed “*recording reproducing apparatus for recording the information into a recording medium*” (lines 7-9) of current application claim 17 corresponds to the “*recording said information on a recording medium*” (lines 3-4) of the ‘540 co-pending application claim 14;

c) the claimed “*charging means for charging a different amount....*” (lines 10-14) of current application claim 17 corresponds to “*said information charged differently....*” (lines 5-8) of the ‘540 co-pending application claim 14; and

d) the claimed “*wherein a unique identification (ID) information is detected....*” (lines 15-19) of current application claim 17 corresponds to the “*said recording medium evaluated to determine ....includes an identifier prior to permitting....*” (lines 9-13) of the ‘540 co-pending application claim 14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to readily recognize that the conflicting claims are different definitions or descriptions of the same subject matter varying in breadth.

Art Unit: 2611

The limitations recited in current application claim 14 corresponds to the limitations recited in the '540 co-pending application claim 14.

The limitations recited in current application claim 18 corresponds to the limitations recited in the '540 co-pending application claim 22.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 14, 17 and 18 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-16 of co-pending Application No. 09/631,542. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are different definitions or descriptions of the same subject matter, varying in breadth. For example:

a) the claimed "*recording medium used for an information on demand system*" (lines 1-3) of current application claim 17 corresponds to "*recording medium for recording information*" (lines 1-3) of the '542 co-pending application claim 14;

Art Unit: 2611

b) the claimed “*recording reproducing apparatus for recording the information into a recording medium*” (lines 7-9) of current application claim 17 corresponds to the “*recording medium for recording information*” (lines 1-3) of the ‘542 co-pending application claim 14;

c) the claimed “*charging means for charging a different amount....*” (lines 10-14) of current application claim 17 corresponds to “*wherein recording of said information...effects charges for said information...*” (lines 8-10) of the ‘542 co-pending application claim 14; and

d) the claimed “*wherein a unique identification (ID) information is detected.....*” (lines 15-19) of current application claim 17 corresponds to the “*an identifier, wherein said information is recorded...based on a presence of said identifier*”.” (lines 4-7) of the ‘542 co-pending application claim 14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to readily recognize that the conflicting claims are different definitions or descriptions of the same subject matter varying in breadth.

The limitations recited in current application claim 14 corresponds to the limitations recited in the ‘542 co-pending application claim 14.

Art Unit: 2611

The limitations recited in current application claim 17 also corresponds to the limitations recited in the '542 co-pending application claim 15.

The limitations recited in current application claim 18 corresponds to the limitations recited in the '542 co-pending application claim 16.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Note to applicant***

5. Applicant is notified that any subsequent amendment to the specification and/or claims must comply with 37 CFR 1.173.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 1-13 would be allowable because the prior art fails to disclose or suggest an information on demand system comprising a charging means for charging a different amount (or subscriber discriminating means for discriminating) for the case in which the information is provided to a display means, a recording means or to both the display and record means or a

Art Unit: 2611

subscriber apparatus comprising a recording and terminal control means having subscriber identification and information identification from a server as recited in the claims.

*Conclusion*

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Horton et al. disclose a television system having different three modes: a) view only; b) view and tape for fee; and c) view and tape for free. See column 3.

Yoshizawa et al., Schuchman and Russo disclose billing for recording in a CATV system.

Verduin discloses different fees for playing a record and viewing a video.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris Grant whose telephone number is (703) 305-4755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 4700.

*Christopher Grant*

**Christopher Grant**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**May 29, 2001**